

No part of the candidate's evidence in this exemplar material may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose of gaining an NZQA qualification or award.

S

93404A



SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

TOP SCHOLAR



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

Tick this box if you
have NOT written
in this booklet

Scholarship 2022 Classical Studies

Time allowed: Three hours
Total score: 24

ANSWER BOOKLET

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

Write your answers to your THREE chosen questions in this booklet. Start your answer to each question on a new page. Carefully number each question.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–23 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.

Question 4. (Appearance of Monarchy)

Augustus was being the pioneer of a shift in Roman structures from a republic to an empire, certainly had skill and an acute awareness of the power structures that preceded and surrounded him. This awareness, of course, began with the cause of his meteoric rise in power and influence in the first place; that is, the death of his adoptive father Julius Caesar. The assassination, [⊗] provided a poignant insight of Augustus in the horns of appearing ~~to~~ similar to a monarch, and became a lesson he learned keenly from the point onwards of 27 BC as he was crowned with his new name. Of course, the statement's inclusion of "extent" suggests a nuance that we should judge with: thus the court of judgement upon Augustus begins, with an analysis of ~~constitutional reform~~ names, ~~religion~~ and ~~succession~~. Power and legacy, [⊗] carried out and justified by the assessors in the name of "protecting the Republic",

To begin, in a ~~keen analysis~~ we might pay keen attention to how Augustus set the tone for his rule. That begins with

the ~~first~~ new name he took on¹ as he
 finally monopolised all power ^{following} ~~before~~ the death
 of Mark Antony. Names, while for a Roman
 women were trivial, were essential for
 Roman men — depicting lineages, connections,
 and for Augustus, ~~associations~~ ~~as~~ associative
 meanings. Taking on Caesar's name gave
 "ex-Octavian" power and an entourage of willing
 clients, and thus 'Caesar' is ~~ob~~ shall obviously
 be retained in his new name; but the
 question hence lies of what to replace
 "Octavian" with, as it reflected his less
 noble equestrian father lineage. Cassius Dio
 rightly notes that "Augustus himself vehemently
 desired to be called Romulus... but when he
 detected suspicion, he gave it up". This
 is a reflection of his avoidance of the appearance
 of a monarchy. To suggest that it was successful
 is perhaps true, but Of course, on while
 Romulus was given up, Augustus had to choose
 a new different but similarly grand name.
 Augustus, from "Aurum", ~~was~~ associated with the
 Augurs that had great interpretive powers in the
 will of the gods, seemed an adequate choice;
 and thus began the reign of Augustus with
 his accumulation of power. It certainly,
 while not choosing Romulus was a success ⁱⁿ of the
 will of Augustus' sentiments, ~~the~~ choice of
 Augustus as a name was rather a close

avoidance; the absolution of power maintained a facade appropriate for its Roman audience, the majority of which either didn't care (the vast majority ^{of the Roman public} were illiterate and didn't necessarily understand the depth of honores) or didn't want to do anything (the senators at this point had realised Augustus' influence after the high profile triple triumphs and Antony's death so likely weren't able to carry out much against Augustus without destabilising the "Republic") & however, perhaps for the modern audience this usage of honores is strange.

Where the avoidance of the Monarchy appearance became more testy led in the consideration of power. As Augustus himself claimed, "I excelled all in influence [auctoritas] but held no greater power [potestas] than the others" (Res Gestae Divi Augusti). Those such as Alison Cooley who ~~clearly~~ regarded RGDA as a political document certainly may regard ~~an~~ critique this claim as ~~off~~ ~~as~~ propagandistic lies — and in this situation, no one inclined to agree. The ~~apparent~~ monopolisation of power carried out by Augustus was extensive and ~~not~~ exhaustive, one that might be best broken down through examining the ~~powers~~ Augustus in constitutional settlements. Aside from the name awarded in 27 BC, Augustus was

also awarded a ^{Golden} shield in commemoration of his war triumphs and the title of proconsular imperator. Proconsular imperator, in particular, reflects a monopolisation of power where Imperator insinuates a ~~power~~ significance above all else. This is furthered with the second and third settlements which included but were not limited to honours of: proconsular imperator ~~meus~~ (where meus made this title perpetual for Augustus), tribunice potestas (the power of the tribunes), and consular potestas (the power of the consul). The power of the tribunes, in particular, ~~was~~ limited only to theoretically ~~was~~ only able to be taken up by plebeians; I question that this power was truly provided to Augustus without second thoughts on what this implicated in Augustus' status of absolute power ~~and~~ use of power and influence. Further more, titles of princeps and pater patriae carried forms of power which were of symbolic significance: first citizen was crucial in ^{the} appearance of "citizen", but the ^{underlying} emphasis is obviously placed on ^{the} "first" rather of this title. Similarly, being the "father of the country" was simply one word short of becoming a full blown monarchy — the power ~~father of pater~~ the "father" in Roman classical culture is deeply embedded as a convention of absolute control (patria potestas), and thus ~~the~~ it is hard to believe that Romans did not consider ~~the~~ what ^{role} Augustus took on as the

one ^{taking up} ~~embodying~~ connotations of absolute power over the entire country.

From this paper, what we might see is a shift from a complete success of maintenance in appearance to a more risky foundation: where although no "monarch" ~~or~~ or "dictator" was mentioned, the connotations of the 'first' and 'absolute power' ~~proved~~ ~~testy~~ ~~in~~ ~~held~~ stopped just short of an overt declaration. We now read ~~the~~ ~~place~~ where Augustus was "not successful" ^{or} in legacy. To put this in context, we must first ask ourselves: who was Augustus avoiding ^{the appearance} "for"? Heading back to my introduction, we may notice that it was by the hands of the republican senators that Julius Caesar had died. The people were ^{loftily} happy with Caesar's mores, so long as they had enough food to eat and did not a roof over their heads. Thus, Augustus did only needed to avoid the ~~presence~~ ~~of~~ ~~a~~ ~~presence~~ of a monarchy within Rome and its proximate regions; elsewhere, he was "unsuccessful" — not because he couldn't succeed, but because he didn't need to 'succeed'. This was reflected in the legacy he instilled in the provinces. ~~It~~ Cassius Dio ~~again~~ mentions the presence of "statues of Augustus close to Rome to be worshipped in the provinces," which "disappeared ~~as~~ in Rome or areas of provinces

close to Rome with many Roman references!
 For many of Religion, in cultures beyond Rome,
 was ~~by~~ instrumental in creating the monarchy.
 Augustus observed this in Egypt, and of course
 allowed for his likenesses to be installed; ~~at~~
 this continual worship of ~~the~~ his statues following
 the previous pharaohs ~~at~~ in Egypt reflects an
 obvious a continuation of Augustus' role as the
 monarchy also. The ~~dis~~ disappearance of these
 states near Rome is a reflection of Augustus'
 "Magnificent" careful balancing act. ~~When he,~~
~~was~~ ~~reg~~ not building overt associations between
 him and being a deity on the level of Rome
 in the presence of Romans who would certainly
 grow suspicious. Succession, ~~on the other hand,~~ ~~was~~
~~so~~ This became a legacy, not only in these
 permanent states — some of which can be
 found in the empire — but a custom of
 emperor worship that persisted in the provinces
 as an obvious reflection of the Monarchy.

The biggest problem that resulted in the downfall
 of the Roman Monarchy, ~~before August~~ ~~app~~
 a few centuries prior was the corruption
 of the Kings and dissatisfaction of the people.
 Augustus, as the one who "feed the see
 from protest" ~~and~~ ~~etc~~ (R&DA), "built
 aqueducts" (R&DA), and established
 a Pax Romana upwards of 200 years

^{instead}
 of 'peace' certainly doesn't belong to the likes
 of these great kings. From analysis, it is
 obvious that ~~there~~ the normal aspect
 was the only the component of Augustus'
 success in ~~avoiding~~ avoiding appearances.
 Power and ~~the~~ legacy, especially in situations
 that did not require and avoidance, were
~~about as close~~ in form as similar to
 a Monarchy as one could get. ~~Nevertheless~~
~~Nevertheless~~, ~~to quote~~ Thus, the extent ~~it~~ stayed
~~as Dio notes~~, "a monarchy in all aspects
 but none" — marginal. But perhaps the better
 question is: ~~was it necessary~~ did it
 matter? For the Roman people and senators,
~~perhaps~~ it didn't after all; regardless
 of the delicate facade in appearance
 was maintained in the way that, despite
 despite ~~deeper~~ ^{that} even the slightest depth
 of consideration would have fallen, no one
 cared enough to think deeper.

Question Twelve (12)

Virgil had significant creative liberties in his creation of the Aeneid. Perhaps it was due to his pastoral background, but we observe an internal tension between ~~the~~ tenderness and brutality within the Aeneid — a reflection of the internal gentility of perhaps that original farm boy who wrote the Georgics and Eclogues, being forced to contend with the violent, bloodthirsty note of a Rome not yet ^{fully} escaped from its centuries of civil war. The characters who suffer at the hands of Aeneas is perhaps no greater example of this phenomenon. Truly, through pudor, Virgil extends his sympathy to these unwitting characters; however, the limits of this extension perhaps exists at the disconnect between ~~the~~ Virgil's intent and that received by the Roman listeners in context.

We begin with Dido, Queen of Carthage. ~~the~~ ~~most~~ ~~creative~~ ~~liberties~~ She is one of the first examples of Virgil's creative liberties; in the original Greek myth of Aeneas, Dido did not have as big a role as ~~she~~ ~~the~~ ~~one~~ she plays in the Aeneid. ~~Through~~ Her stage presence truly provided Virgil and opportunity ~~for~~ to flesh out her character.

into the intelligent and passionate Queen of
 Carthage we find Aeneas encounters in Book 4.
~~and her~~ Certainly, the association between
 Dido and connotations of Dido's skills
~~impressive~~ great: ekphrasis is used in noting the
 grandness of her city and palaces, describing
 a 'bustling population' with 'toney city walls'.
 Dido This power is perhaps to build a positive
 impression ^{on} of Roman readers of Dido, ~~and~~
~~certainly~~ which supports her the buildup
 of sympathy later sympathy for in Dido's
 downfall. As noted by Leme, Dido is indeed:
 conventionally ashamed of her love of Aeneas,
 due to a multitude of factors such as her
 considerations of her first husband and Aeneas'
 destiny; this ~~likely~~ reinforcement of the ~~role~~
~~of~~ moral conventions of Rome potentially may
 have been to build stronger sympathy for Dido's
 plight and fears. However, it is not we cannot
 be sure as to whether Virgil's means was
 truly successful: ~~to~~ above all, we need to note
 Dido's status as a ~~to~~ woman and the double
 standards Romans held with respect to ~~women~~
 love ~~of~~ and relationships for women and men.
 That Catherine Edwards notes that "Dido
 became a figure of a temptress in her attempts
 to counteract fate" for the Roman people;
 in this way, perhaps the Romans did not truly
 gain any sympathy for Dido's death —

perhaps a deserved turn of fate instead, destined to become the resentful ghost in Book 6's visit to the underworld. It is also up for contention whether Virgil even fully attempted to create sympathy for Dido. For one, the beauty of Carthage is contrasted by the loquacity of Virgil in describing the "Great craves that have come to a stand still" — with this contrast in productivity perhaps putting more negative connotations on Dido's newfound obsession of love. For two, the death of Dido was preceded by a dramatic confrontation between Dido and Aeneas, during which Dido had desperately pleaded "in incomprehensibly long, ~~very~~ overflowing lines: "please — If I ever made you happy — please — please — have pity". These are contrasted with Aeneas' measured measured, staccato syllables of "I must leave. I thank you for your kindness". One could potentially claim that the pudor associated with this begging was fully to establish sympathy for Dido, ~~but it~~ ^{but it seems more like a} contrast Aeneas' stoicism and ~~desire~~ ^{loyalty} to his destiny. For the Roman readers this is perhaps a question for the modern readers to ponder more; for the Roman readers, the Dido's gender and association with her "fire of fire" of love was perhaps become the disconnect between whatever Virgil's intent was of sympathy.

and their perceived intentions of 'a rightful punishment for Dido'.

In the second half of the Aeneid, the mortal Aeneas echoes the Iliad lending itself to more opportunities for Aeneas' opposition to face deaths that garner sympathy. Mezentius and Turnus are two such examples, ~~but~~ with similar views of ~~their~~ purpose and progression.

Mezentius' death amongst the chaos of the Latin war can perhaps be noted as a ~~tragedy~~: another brutal casualty of the war. However, Virgil's purpose in pitying Mezentius in a humiliated ~~poor~~ position of begging is a reflection to ~~create~~ ^{both both} sympathy for Aeneas' victims, but also to contrast Aeneas' furor. There is a reason why no such pity was applied to ~~other~~ those such as Camilla or Pallas; for Pallas, he served as a touching catalyst for Aeneas to display his piety in funeral rites, while Camilla was to serve as a reminder of the importance of a leader in battle. These ~~people~~ ^{characters} did not get pity and ~~turn~~ that humanised them on some level, because Virgil had a different purpose for them; on a similar level, the creation of some pity for Mezentius — more likely to have evoked pity than Dido, as a man who dies in the context of war rather than

a woman who kills herself for love — is not for ~~establish~~ ~~as~~ for the purpose of a means to build sympathetic characters. Instead, it is to reflect the furor and cruelty of war, as Aeneas murders Mezentius and others in cold blood and rage. Duckworth's comment that the "Aeneid was a response to the canons of civil war that preceded it" thus helps explain Virgil's purpose in the death of ~~Turnus~~ Mezentius: indeed, one to use humilia to evoke sympathy for Mezentius, but moreover, to use that sympathy to propel the anti-war message at the core of Virgil's identity and intense Aeneas' cruelty, as the true end of the means.

Finally, the death of Turnus is a curious Jackson case. On the one hand, some critics claim such as Wilhelm claim that the death of Turnus is a form of "poetic justice", but on the other, some such as Edwards claim that the death is a "solemn warning". Its polarizing nature is reflected in the tension that exists between sympathy created for Turnus and the justice of his ~~death~~ ~~against~~ his ~~egotistical~~ egotistical murder of Pallas. However, ~~the~~ the moment of pudor comes starkly and suddenly, at the end of book 12: ~~as~~ Juno's sudden relentment comes to ~~save~~ make Turnus

to take a crucial loss, to subject him to the
 destiny plotted out by fate & loss. ~~How~~ The degree
 of loss, however, lies in Aeneas' hands.
 We hear Turnus' pleads of his father's back home,
 heeding the values of piety; nevertheless,
 Aeneas, "boiling with rage, buries his blade
 deep in Turnus' ~~breast~~ breast"; and the soul
 is left to flee, "mourning, resentful, to
 the shades". This context alone may be
 strong argument for a puer used as the
 means for sympathy. However, if we
 take a step back and note that the
 reason Aeneas boiled with rage was because
 he saw Pallas' belt, ~~the~~ Virgil's masterful
 ambiguity comes through: is the ~~sy~~ humiliation
 and link to Roman piety an acknowledgement
 of Turnus' sympathy or an ~~po~~ ironic justice
 that in return for Turnus' prideful display
 of war spoils? We might suggest that there
 is some extent in ~~see~~ creating sympathy
 for Turnus, which could be ~~but~~ belated by
 Aeneas' defense of ~~piety~~ ~~piety~~ piety through
 justice for Evander; what we know for sure
 is that the connotations of rage are certainly
 not an admonishment of guilt, and the
 sympathy that is generated for Turnus is for
 the purposes of furthering admonishment. Finally,
 It could also be noted that this sudden, large
 ending aligns with the sympathy that Rome

Section B question Seventeen (E-H),

Women were in a complicated position in Rome. They were certainly not as empowered as ~~today~~ many societies of today, but of their age they were at the least better treated than their Greek counterparts. Here, the Leg, let us examine the status of women through 3 lenses: the political, ~~the personal and the~~ and personal of the powerful, and the personal of more ~~unfortunate~~ common people.

The political state of women were highly limited. They could not vote; they were passed under authority, ~~consequently~~ ^{the protector of} from their fathers to the Merus of their husbands. Nevertheless, certain exceptions within history exist, and Agrippa Agrippina is a poignant example. Her Resource H suggests of her power and status. From H(ii), what we observe is a relief of skillful sculpture: Agrippina is the one crowning her son, the emperor, and they are on equal standing. This provides fascinating insight on the amount of power that this woman singularly achieved. Certainly, in contrast to the usual down cast eyes of women in Scott sculptures with men, Agrippina is

looking straight at Nero; she is ~~crossing~~
 Nero, as the man, is instead they one with
 eyes down cast as he respectfully crowned
 by his mother. They ~~carry~~ both cornucopias,
 suggest that Agrippina also has part in the
 power ~~and~~ — she holds the cornucopie
 as a symbol of prosperity, ~~and has~~
 This is a reflection of the unique control
 that Agrippina had over her sons affairs, and
~~the~~ reflects the possibilities that a woman
 could still achieve in political status. This
 is further reflected in the coins as the the left
 face shows Agrippina and Nero face to face.
 Coins were a key medium of propaganda;
 owing to their importance and widespread
 nature, the presence of Agrippina at such a
 level with Nero reflects her impressive power
 and high political status. These had obvious
 political implications, where Agrippina
 could advise the emperor of the vast Roman
 Empire and on many levels dictate affairs;
 her influence was manifested in resources
~~to~~ H (i) and (ii), in these permanent
 forms, but undoubtedly extended beyond
 records. Of course, this political anomaly
~~is~~ ~~had~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ ~~intended~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~unstable~~
 in Rome's deeply misogynistic society, and
 should be considered as such. She
 was ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~murdered~~ by the hands of

her son and notably said for them to "Get
 "the womb that she birthed him with fast".
 A headstrong, ambitious woman who provided
 herself insight into the ~~boundaries~~^{time} boundary
 of a woman's political status; a reflection
 of how women's ~~power~~^{associations} were limited to
 the children they could ~~raise~~ birth and
 raise, but nevertheless an impressive record
 by Agrippa.

Agrippa is part of a handful of women
 who were successful in their campaign
 for political power — Livia, being a notable
 Cornelia being notable others — but for
 more weight we should look away from
 the extreme in to power and likelihood, and look
 more towards ~~personal~~ the personal, with a
 more representative view of the status of these
 powerful women. Resource F, ~~from Cicero~~
 a collection of letters from Cicero, reflects
 the status and power struggles of women in
 a more domestic sphere. Terentia is a more
 common example of a high status Roman
 woman, being the wife of the notable politician
 Cicero, but we must again note the distinction
 between her status and the other married
 Roman wives. She is ambitious and tries to
 touch in the sphere of Cicero's political perplexities,
 although notably less successful than Agrippa.

The first letter ~~from~~ ^{to} Atticus, a few years after their initial marriage, reflects a more idyllic role in personal status: Cicero considers his wife highly in her ability to provide moments of repose (along with his children). Of course, Cicero being a noted tradition conservative in the Roman political sphere (even of his time), is not light on his morals: he ~~considers~~ ~~to~~ addresses his daughter affectionately albeit playfully derogatorily as a pet without name, and sets up a dichotomy between his family and "the great". Nevertheless, he is affectionate, ~~and~~ which is further supported by his ~~house~~ personal letter to Terentia: "you are showing a virtue and courage surpassing belief" and asks her to "mind [her] send me letters - covers, that I may know what is going on and what you are all doing". This reflects a level of respect that even old Cicero holds for his wife. Of course, this is complemented by the final journey of their ~~own~~ marriage, as Terentia shows her ability to control money in the domestic sphere; Cicero complains of insufficient funds as a reflection of Terentia's prudence (10 instead of 12 sestertii). This is, ~~not~~ ~~conceivably~~, a reflection of Terentia's power and status on the personal level: for these well-off families who are likely to partake in more equal confederatio marriages, the woman's status is not necessarily as high as

one may ~~also~~ assume with the presence of
 Menus ~~are~~ by the husband over the wife.

Nevertheless, even the privileged patrician families are not representative of the wider
 world: the low look to Rome with
 funerary reliefs that reflect on freedwomen
 and their ties. Vestina ~~and~~ Incuade and
 Kesterii, both women with no association with
 particular political power, have successfully
 established themselves with wealth and permanence.
 They provide unique insight into the way
 that even normal women — moreover, those
 who were likely slaves — had some level of
 status in Rome which was perhaps higher than
 to be expected. They can be immortalised
 in the sculpture of a funerary relief, as
 seen by Vestina Incuade, or even better,
 be immortalised lengthily in a well-carved
 tomb as she is depicted to recline on
 a couch with her family at the top of
 Rome (G.111). ^(P21) Of course, there are
 still some subtle bonds of status — for
 Incuade's betrothal or ring is a reflection
 of wider Roman customs in which the
 women wear iron rings around their
 middle finger, to promote chastity as
 doctors claimed that the middle finger takes

centered a nerve that ~~linked~~ to their
 hearts. ~~My father was, the same~~
 (prose p20) Her wealth is also established with
 elaborate carvings and the presence of slaves
 which she had the authority to free.

However, to conclude, ~~what we~~ while we may
 appreciate the insight these resources provided in
 explaining the status that women can acquire,
 we ~~may~~ need to acknowledge caveats. The
 status that these women acquired certainly
 subverts some level of expectation that Rome
 was always a strict misogynistic patriarchy
 (a title perhaps better reserved for the
 Greeks), these resources are not representative
 of the ~~truth~~ true population. Notably, Cicero's
 Pro Coelio speech in response to reflect this
 more generalized sentiment: the Roman's
 sins in slavery by wealthy or free were recorded
 as sinful, ~~for~~ for the other resources, their immorality
~~and status~~ is a result of their unusually high
 status — economically, politically, personally
 or otherwise — and are not representative
 of the vast majority of women who ~~are~~ ^{did not have}
 forced to remain voiceless and faceless, ^{as high}
 with nothing in the Marbled Rome that was ^{of a}
 willing to record their lies. ^{status}

→ ② It is no surprise that we should see the

tragic end of Agrippine or the divorce of
Terentia, and they also remind us of
what usually happens when a woman attempts
to reach higher status as men may do, or
their ~~reliance~~ reliance on men be merciful
to maintain their status.]